

Appl. No.: 09/328,742

Response to Office communication dated: 7/18/2003

Attorney Docket: UCONAP/141/US

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

The July 18, 2003 Office communication stated that the present application contained the following patentably distinct inventions.

- I. Claims 1-9 and 12-22, drawn to a method of administering X-Y-Z compound to an animal or a human, classified in class 514, subclasses 5-6, 603.
- II. Claims 10 and 11, drawn to a method of administering a hydroxy compound outside of the scope of X-Y-Z to an animal or a human, classified in class 514, subclass 724.

MPEP section 803 states (underlining added) "If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions."

Applicants respectfully traverse the above election requirement on the grounds that the compounds of claims 10 and 11 are sufficiently similar to the compounds of claim 1 that a search and examination of all of the claims at one time would not appear to be a serious burden.

In order to strictly comply with this election requirement Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, the asserted invention of claims 1-9 and 12-22.

REMARKS

No claims have been added or cancelled. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. The amendment is supported by the specification at page 9, lines 15-18 and the structures of page 17, Table 1. Claims 1-22 are pending in the application.

Appl. No.: 09/328,742

Response to Office communication dated: 7/18/2003

Attorney Docket: UCONAP/141/US

The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant(s)' attorney if it is deemed that a telephone conversation will hasten prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Alexandros MAKRIYANNIS et al

Date: 8/18/2003
750 Main Street- Suite 1400
Hartford, CT 06103-2721
(860) 527-9211

By: 

James E. Piotrowski
Registration No. 43,860
Alix, Yale & Ristas, LLP
Attorney for Applicants